

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 4, 2012

AGENDA

- 1. Community Plan 2012 Amendment
12-046ADM
(Presentation and Discussion)**

Administrative Request

New Case

- 2. Stansbury at Muirfield
12-062CP
(Presentation and Discussion)**

**10799 Drake Road
Concept Plan**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Victoria Newell, Warren Fishman, Joe Budde, and John Hardt. City representatives were Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Justin Goodwin, Aaron Stanford, Sharonda Whatley, Tori Proehl, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Claudia Husak requested that the Commissioners sign and return the Administrative Orders distributed regarding the City's email and technology policies. She reminded the Commissioners to check their Dublin email accounts for Commission related updates.

Ms. Husak reminded the Commissioners to bring their Zoning Code books to be updated with new pages and asked the Commissioners who preferred to use the on-line Zoning Code rather than a hard copy to let her know.

She said that she would discuss the trip they are planning during the Commission Roundtable.

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes announced that since many residents were present for Case 2 and Case 1 was an Administrative Request, that the order of the two cases on the published Agenda would be reversed. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- 1. Community Plan 2012 Amendment
12-046ADM**

Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this Administrative Request for review of potential amendments to the Special Area Plans of the 2007 Community Plan as part of the 2012 Community Plan Amendment process,

including updates to the texts and graphics of the Avery Road/Bright Road, Coffman Park, and Southwest Area Plans.

Justin Goodwin presented this Administrative Request using the City's website to display and discuss the potential amendments and proposed revisions to the texts and maps. He said that the Community Plan website is now directly linked from the City's main page, by clicking on 'Community Plan' at the top of the page where the Special Area Plans tab is located at the top. Mr. Goodwin explained that it was a work in progress, there are some technical difficulties that are being addressed, and it was constantly being improved. He said the text amendments that have been added are coordinated with specific revisions to the Code with links on the graphics with design recommendations indicated for each Plan. Mr. Goodwin demonstrated the functionality of the Community Plan/Special Area Plans website link.

Mr. Taylor asked how many people have worked on the very complex website.

Mr. Goodwin said that Bruce Edwards, Dublin's website editor and GIS Administrator, Brandon Brown had developed the website.

John Hardt asked if once this is all on the website, is the intent to still go through a periodic major update process or to have the updates be more fluid and occasional.

Mr. Goodwin said they had been discussing how future updates would be done. He said he thought it was likely that there would be more periodic and fluid updates and from time to time a very major and comprehensive update is envisioned. Mr. Goodwin said he is drafting a set of recommended procedures and protocols on how to deal with periodic amendments to the Plan using technology that makes it easier to do more often. He said it would likely be done once or twice a year, unless there is something major to add.

Avery Road Corridor Plan

Mr. Goodwin said the two focus areas included were the Avery-Shier Rings and Avery-Woerner Temple areas. He said that the Engineering Department had asked that the design recommendation be clarified to make it clear on the central illustration of the improvement to the Avery/US 33 interchange, because it is one option and that it is not known exactly what the interchange design will be.

Mr. Goodwin said changes involved the Avery Road/Tuswell Drive roundabout that was not constructed in 2007, but is done now, so that recommendation can be removed. He said similarly, there is a historic cemetery very close to that intersection and there was a constraint on the roadway alignment. He said there was a recommendation to align the roadway in a manner that would not impact the cemetery that was successfully done, so that recommendation can be removed. Mr. Goodwin said a graphic change will be on the south portion of this focus area. He explained that for the approved planned development rezoning for the Dan Sherri/Marcus office development, it was reflected that there was a design recommendation preserving existing trees on the site as a buffer to the neighborhood.

Mr. Goodwin said in the Avery Road/Woerner Temple area only one potential change has been identified and is highlighted. He said a graphic provision has not yet been proposed on the mix of undeveloped land and offices in the area of Corporate Center Drive. He explained that the front portion of the area was rezoned as Tech Flex last year and the rear portion was rezoned to a Planned Unit Development that essentially references a Suburban Office district, so it would come to the Commission if it developed. Mr. Goodwin said that this area plan illustrates it and labels it as Mixed Residential Medium Density, but it is zoned for Office. He said that there is going to be Office in front of it and it is thought that it likely would develop as Office at some point. He said that he will attend the annual meetings of the owners and condominium owner associations of Cramer's Crossing this month to discuss this with them, ask for their feedback, and bring a potential recommendation to revise this plan based on the feedback received.

Emerald Corporate District

Mr. Goodwin said that they were incorporating the Business District concept into the area plans, and the first one they have begun is the Emerald Corporate District, which is the Emerald Parkway Corridor from the south boundary of the City to Sawmill Road. He said it overlaps with two of the existing area plans in the Community Plan now, so they are approaching these as focus areas within the Emerald Corporate District.

Bright Road Area Plan

Mr. Goodwin said that in the Bright Road area there is a minor graphic revision. He said in 2007, the intersection design was not known for Bright Road in the final phase of Emerald Parkway and was shown as a standard intersection. He said it is now known that it is going to be a roundabout and this is reflected as the final design, with the exception of the conceptual access points into the new development areas. He said they are also proposing to add a design point for this area plan with some text along with it to explore opportunities for a vehicular overpass connection between Emerald Parkway and the Bridge Street District. He said Planning and Engineering had discussed it conceptually and thought it was an interesting concept that should be explored because it could provide additional alleviation from the impact on Sawmill Road.

Mr. Goodwin said that Parks and Open Space has prepared a detailed Master Plan for a new park involving the Holder/Wright earthworks and the old farmstead and they would like to reference that Master Plan and link from this map directly to the Parks and Open Space Master Plan, but it was not set up yet.

Coffman Park Area Plan

Mr. Goodwin said the proposal was to rename this area to something like the Emerald Perimeter Focus Area with the focus changed from Coffman Park itself. He said the reason was that Parks and Open Space had developed a more detailed Master Plan for Coffman Park that is substantially different from what was drawn in the 2007 Community Plan which can be linked to that as an additional functionality of this program. He said that the City had liquidated property that was originally intended to be part of Coffman Park. He said that in the 2007 Community Plan, a very large pond was shown in the middle of the park, called 'Sail Pond' but is not in the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.

Mr. Goodwin said one approach proposed was to remove Coffman Park from this area and simply defer to the Parks and Open Space Master Plan. He said they were being a little inconsistent because the Holder/Wright Park was left in the Bright Road Area Plan, so he was interested in the Commission's thoughts as to which is the most appropriate approach.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that Perimeter Drive was recommended to be widened in the Plan, and it has happened with the construction of the Commerce Parkway roundabout. He said that a graphic provision they are proposing for this plan involves the potential for development along Post Road. He said the whole area was rezoned last year for Office, consistent with the Future Land Use Map. He said there has been interest in developing the City-owned and privately owned-land referred to as the bow-tie, between Emerald Parkway, Post Road and I-270. He said it was a difficult site to develop and could be a good opportunity for additional development here if massed with the City's land. He said therefore, they are showing a potential new office building in this location, but it is important to emphasize with a design point that access should, if at all possible be shared with the property to the west from Emerald Parkway rather than Post Road. He said that access onto Post Road will be very problematic, given its proximity to the Post Road and Emerald Parkway intersection. Mr. Goodwin said that Engineering would like to discourage. Mr. Goodwin said another design point was to protect existing tree rows and stands in this area, if development does happen.

Mr. Goodwin said a proposed design point to add here is creating a shared use path connection from the existing path underneath I-270 along the South Fork of the Indian Run and connecting into Coffman Park as part of this larger greenway concept discussed with Bridge Street and Citywide.

Mr. Goodwin said similar to the change to the Coffman Park Master Plan itself, there is a conceptual rendering where the ponds were shown on the graphic that will be revised.

Mr. Goodwin requested Commission feedback and offered the following points to facilitate the Commission's discussion:

- Are the proposed revisions (and the reasoning behind them) being clearly communicated with text and illustrations?
- Is more information necessary?
- Does the Commission agree that the proposed revisions are appropriate for consideration or should be further modified?
- Are there additional plan modifications that should also be considered?
- Are there any issues with the functionality of the Community Plan website and map viewer that could be improved to enhance user experience?

Richard Taylor asked if someone wanted to know about a specific area plan, was there a way to quickly find it.

Mr. Goodwin said there was a word search feature on the website that could be used to find information included on the Community Plan. He said at some point however, they get to the point where does the Community Plan end and the CIP begin. He said there is an obvious connection and nearly everything major in the CIP is in some way represented in the Community Plan. He said they had discussed that every time there is a chance to link out to other related information that it could be done.

John Hardt said he thought the parklands should be included because he thought the average Dublin citizen was probably as interested in what is going on with the parks as they were about where the next roundabout is going to be located. He pointed out that his coworkers who lived in Dublin, when looking at this and proposed development, did not understand the distinction. He suggested that at the beginning of the Community Plan there needed a clear statement about what the Community Plan is.

Mr. Goodwin said for each of the Area Plans in the printed copy of the Community Plan, that there is a disclaimer statement. He said it had been incorporated into the text box and they are discussing how to make it more prominent. He said that Council was very concerned about it as well. He said it is clear that these are conceptual illustrations and that specifics of the development will be determined through the Development Review Process.

Victoria Newell said that none of the community websites that she uses at work has graphics and information as good as the City of Dublin. She said it worked better on her personal computer than on her iPad with some of the functions available. Ms. Newell suggested a disclaimer be located on the introductory page. She said other cities had just 'Pick a PDF' so you got an overall PDF plan so that you do not have the regenerations issue that you have when you start to move through maps and sites. Ms. Newell suggested that where the 'strikeout text' was located, if where you could find it was in a color, it would draw attention to it. She said it was hard to find.

Joe Budde suggested a way to distinguish the Plan and the concept against what is already here or approved would be through color or things already there, highly defined, whereas things that are concepts or the plan were all white, but he did not think it would do it justice. He said maybe those parts could be fuzzy or things approved or in place could be more highly defined. He said sometimes when he moved, he would see the 'Google Earth thing' and then it would go away.

Mr. Goodwin said that was an additional functionality that they have already discussed doing. He said the much earlier prototype of this had a slider so that you could actually slide away the area plan graphic and to see the actual aerial photograph underneath it.

Mr. Budde suggested that the existing part could be the Google Map, and then what the Community Plan is could be fuzzy, but colored with the target and the blue and yellow dots.

Amy Kramb said she had no comments about the interactive map and its functionality because it did not work for her all.

Mr. Goodwin encouraged the Commissioners to keep visiting the site to see ongoing improvements.

Ms. Kramb agreed that the park plan should be included. She said regarding the text in general, when adding text, it needed to be kept short and simple. She said that some very long sentences had been added to the Community Plan part of the text. She said the second sentence of the National Church Residences update was long with five commas, three of which could be deleted. She recommended that when in doubt, make a new sentence, rather than keep adding more. Ms. Kramb said if there is a comma followed by the word 'and' there needs to be a full sentence with a noun and verb, not a fragment. She said the comma separates two sentences. She said to make sure that the second clause is a full sentence, otherwise, delete the 'and'.

Mr. Goodwin asked Ms. Kramb to email specifics.

Ms. Kramb said in the Avery Road text, 'historic structures' were specifically referenced which could cause problems later for the City. She said when federal money is tied to any project; the word 'historic' has a very significant impact as far as environmental regulations go. She recommended not calling something 'historic' unless necessary, because that meant they were eligible to be on the National Register for Historic Places versus the Ohio Historical Inventory (OHI).

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments. [There was no one left in the audience.]

Mr. Goodwin said that the Community Plan was included on the October 11th meeting agenda. He said that a Community Plan report will not be included in the packet, but that he would report what had been added to the website.

2. Stansbury at Muirfield 12-062CP

10799 Drake Road Concept Plan

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting review and non-binding feedback on a concept plan for a new planned unit development on an 11.75-acre site with 19 residential lots. She said the site was located on the east side of Drake Road, approximately 200 feet south of the intersection with Springburn Drive.

Richard Taylor recused himself from this case due to a conflict of interest because he is an employee of the Muirfield Association and a member of the Muirfield Design Review Committee.

Warren Fishman disclosed that he had attended a Muirfield Village Board meeting where the applicant, Bill Adams, had presented a plan for this project. He said that the Law Director's Office had informed him that it would not prevent him from participating in the capacity of a Commission member regarding this application.

Claudia Husak presented this concept plan application. She explained that a concept plan is the first step that the Dublin Zoning Code sets aside for the establishment of a PUD, Planned Unit Development District. She said the concept plan is a step above the Informal as a required step for sites that do not meet the Community Plan or that are over 25 acres, and it is a voluntary process. Ms. Husak explained the steps following the concept plan are the preliminary development plan, which in the PUD process is the rezoning of the property, and then the final development plan, which typically includes the final plat. She said that out of all of these processes, the concept plan can be reviewed by City Council if the applicant chooses and the preliminary development plan requires approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

Ms. Husak said the site consists of two parcels with access from Drake Road. She said the 2007 Community Plan Future Use Map shows the site as the lowest density which is what is what the zoning currently prescribes for the parcel, the R, Rural District. She said surrounding lots in Muirfield are in the medium density, 1.5 to 2.0-units per acre, in the Community Plan.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant came to the Commission for an informal review application in August and there were concerns about the proposed density which was 2.0-units per acre. She said the applicant has lowered the density on this proposal to 1.6-units per acre, the lower end of the surrounding densities. She said that meant the proposed number of lots was reduced from 24 to 19 lots.

Ms. Husak presented a comparison of the site plan proposed at the Informal Review with this Concept plan. She said the Informal Review Plan focused on a cluster-type development where open space was preserved around the site on the perimeter as well as the center in some areas, and the lots were more clustered in an east/west arrangement. She said those proposed 24 lots were empty-nester style housing, with a density of 2.08-units per acre with approximately 50 percent open space.

Ms. Husak said this concept plan shows 19 traditional single family lots located along one main road, coming off Drake Road with a loop road at the end of the road. She said the open space included on the lot, is included in the applicant's open space calculation, which would not be counted typically. Ms. Husak said with the numbers and plans available, Planning estimated the common open space as 20 to 25 percent for this concept plan. Ms. Husak said the lots were very large because one road accesses them and there are lots on either side. She said that along the front of the road, a black dotted line on the plan showed approximately a 30-foot setback from the road for all of the lots. She said there is also a yellow line on the rear of the lots. She said Lots 1 through 12, the line is 50 feet from the rear lot line, and Lots 13 through 19, the line is 30 feet. Ms. Husak said the intent for the area is to function like a No-Build Zone so that new development would not be able to take place in the area, such as homes, driveways, patios, decks, or outdoor amenities. She said that the applicant is also intending to use this area for tree replacement, based on the Tree Replacement Ordinance.

Ms. Husak said that this proposal includes a sidewalk on the south side of the proposed road with a tree lawn and street trees on both side of the road. She said that Planning and the applicant are aware that this is not the typical Muirfield Village street-type design. She said, however the Subdivision Regulations require a sidewalk on both sides of the street, and the sidewalk as shown would connect to a path for the open space which would then connect to the Muirfield public path system in the south side as well as in the northwestern portion of the site. Ms. Husak said that Planning is encouraging the applicant toward the sidewalk arrangement for these lots.

Ms. Husak said that the proposed open space is shown in the area of the stream and Stream Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ), which is required. She said that it was discussed at the last meeting that there is also on the Geographic Information System (GIS) that the City maintains, a SCPZ in the southwestern area of the site. She said at the preliminary development plan stage, the applicant would have to study both areas to determine if the area warrants a SCPZ, and specifically, the width of the Zone. Ms. Husak said in the open space areas, the area south of the road, and the cul-de-sac bulb, stormwater

management is proposed. She said that preliminary stormwater management data would be required at the preliminary development plan stage.

Ms. Husak said regarding Lot 1, which is pie-shaped and therefore has a triangular buildable area, concerns Planning in regard to home and driveway location as well as lack of usable outdoor spaces. She said that Planning would like the applicant to address the buildability of uniquely-shaped Lot 12 and where the side yard and rear yard setbacks are to ensure that those requirements would be stated in the preliminary development plan. Ms. Husak said that a 60-foot road frontage requirement is included in the Subdivision Regulations, but Lot 13, which is shaped uniquely to avoid the SCPZ, has 20 feet of frontage and Planning is concerned that is not enough space to access the lot adequately.

Ms. Husak said that Planning is recommending that the applicant move forward to a preliminary development plan stage, incorporating comments and feedback from the Commission based on the following proposed discussion questions:

- 1) Is the reduction in density from 2 units per acre to 1.6 units per acre adequate to address the Commission's previous concerns regarding density?
- 2) Should the applicant make changes to the proposed layout?
- 3) What architectural character is appropriate for this development?
- 4) Whether or not including the proposal as part of the Muirfield Association and making the Muirfield Architectural Review Board do architectural review for this area, whether or not that is sufficient, or do we want to see more in a potential development text?

The applicant, Bill Adams, State Street Realty, 6580 Cook Road, said that they realized that engineering details, stormwater management, a stream corridor study, and tree surveys are required at the preliminary development plan stage. He said they understood that those types of issues would be addressed in detail and that it was a condition of the project moving forward to create satisfactory conditions to meet those requirements.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application.

Walter Zeier, General Manager, Muirfield Association, 8372 Muirfield Drive, said that the Board of Directors and the Design Control Committee had reviewed this plan and would like it to move forward. He said they would like to review all of the stormwater management, tree replacement, and all that type of information in the future which they understand is included in the following step. He said they wanted to make sure they had a commitment from the developer to bring it within The Muirfield Association and have all of the deed standards as well as design control restrictions placed on this property. Mr. Zeier said that they were interested in having a sub-association to look at how they are going to manage the open space. He said whether management of the open space would be up to The Muirfield Association or a sub-association would be decided by the Board of Directors and the developer.

Russ Randall, 8883 Belisle Court, said that this property is currently zoned for a density of 12 to 15 units. He said they realized when they purchased their property that there would someday be a development. He pointed out that the Commission had disapproved other proposed plans based on various reasons, and he was not sure what he saw here was other than the convenience or expediting of getting this off the rolls into the Muirfield Association. He said he was not sure this proposal causing a change in the variance is any different than other previous proposals. He said the plan is nice, but the developer will be able to clear out the trees completely, except on the greenbelt with disregard for the current wildlife and the runoff. He said this was a much nicer plan than the previous one and he commended the developer for taking time to come up with a nicer visual. Mr. Randall said he did not want to see the density maintained from what it was set years ago which was in the best interest of the community.

Alesia Miller, 8445 Gullane Court, said if the existing stream is taken away, it would fill in a flood zone and take away part of the ecosystem. She said everyone lives downstream and we are all connected to the nature of this small rural area and will be affected if it is overdeveloped. She said she thought the low density is the only density acceptable, considering the precious stream is a riparian habitat which is like a sponge that absorbs the pollution coming from existing yards and the earth. She said it gives a chance for the pollution to be extracted out of the water before it reaches the next capillary or river. She said it is not preserved there will be more pollution and run-off from driveways, sidewalks, and yard chemicals. She said it is all going to runoff and cause flooding, and eventually the houses will have problems with their basements, as she has now. Ms. Miller said she thought it should be preserved and that low density was the only thing she could find acceptable.

Jamie Zitesman, 5701 Springburn Drive, said he was concerned how long it would take to develop and construct the project. He said he would like to see the site development be completed as quickly as possible. He asked if the residents would be able to get assurances from the Commission to help control site development for a reasonable period. Mr. Zitesman was concerned about Lots 1, 12, and 13 being usable lots and requested assurance to the community that Planning will work with the developer to come up with plans for good usable lots that are not odd-shaped. Mr. Zitesman asked regarding drainage, whether retention ponds are going to be created to deal with the water issues and concerns of the community. He asked if working with the Commission and the developer that they would come up with a plan where these issues would be addressed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said with a number of them, yes. She said that regarding timing of construction, they will apply for a permit which would be good for a specific duration of time. She said the permits are renewable, but the Commission does not have the authority to limit them to a number of days.

Mr. Zitesman asked how long it would be before typical permits would expire.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the permit is good for a year and it is renewable.

Mark Chambers, 5790 Springburn Drive, said there had been many concerns about the stream. He said that Mr. Kinzelman's previous comment that there was no water flow was probably regrettable. He said he thought he was talking about the collection area on the site near the road is that tends to be dry from time to time, as opposed to the stream, which everyone knows that there is water flow most of the time. Mr. Chambers said he believed the density is probably appropriate for the area, but he was not sure how it became significantly lower than the surrounding homes. He said he knew it was something that the City did before, but he was not sure how it occurred or the purpose for doing that as opposed to being characteristic to rest of the area. He said they were not in place when Muirfield Village was first developed in the 1970s. He said there was not a lot of building and development control exercised at that time. He said he was comfortable that the run-off controls and storm sewer, and things like that can be addressed. He said addressing the requirements may fix some existing problems. He said he thought the developer would have to work to make the lots buildable. He urged the applicant to move forward in the process. He said in the process itself, everything will be worked out to where it was acceptable to everyone. Mr. Chambers said regarding construction traffic, time is money to the developer, so he did not expect it to be prolonged. He encouraged the Commissioners and Planning to continue working with the applicant to support the process in this in working with the Muirfield Association and the developer.

Jeff Schoener, 5825 Springburn Drive, said he was not anti-development. He said he was impressed that the developer had one of the better landscape architects in the City. He said he brought photos of the large amount of water coming through the area, starting at where the line meets Drake Road, after a large 20-minute rainstorm. He asked if as the flow comes through the new development, would there be something in place to prevent more back up before it goes downstream. He said he wanted City Council to be made aware that there is a lot of water that could come back up towards the homes along Lots 4, 5, 3, 2, and 1.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Commission has a rule that they cannot accept any new data the evening of a hearing. She explained that it had to flow through Planning. She said this was not the last time this will be heard and that he could give the photos to Ms. Husak.

Mr. Schoener said the amount of traffic from 19 lots would be a lot on the skinny street. He said he supported a smart development, but not 19 lots and that the amount of traffic needed to be considered on the street.

Jean Fox, 8860 Braids Court, suggested that an independent third party engineering firm be consulted to study and assess the stormwater runoff through the existing and new homes. She said she concurred with the others that there was wisdom put in place initially when the site was zoned low density and she thought there was wisdom in keeping it that way.

Patti King, 8882 Nairn Court said that where the bikepath behind her dipped, it filled with rain during storms. She said they also got runoff from the farm and a mound that Muirfield built. She said people cannot use the bikepath when it rains hard. She said she feared that Lots 17 and 14 will cause more runoff in that area. Ms. King said she would like to see some evidence that it will not happen after development.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the correspondence received regarding this application had been distributed to the Commissioners to read.

Mr. Randall asked that the process steps and timeframes that follow a concept plan be described.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is a concept plan where the Commission provides non-binding feedback to the developer. She said the Commission discusses and provides the applicant some direction that they would like to see them go. She said the applicant does not have to take the direction, and the Commission has the right to change it. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that no vote is taken. She said afterwards, if an applicant decides to move forward they'd be required to file a preliminary development plan application which is the rezoning to a PUD. Ms. Amorose Groomes said a large list of issues is given to the applicant by Planning that they will have to provide at the preliminary development plan stage. She said the application is submitted to Planning who will review everything. She explained that the City's Engineering Department will then carefully review, verify, or ask for additional information or clarification of how the applicant came to the decisions they came to in a series. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the application will be placed on the Commission meeting agenda, and it would also require two visits to City Council. She said it was a long process designed to be lengthy so that the Commission has the opportunity to vet all the issues and so that the public gets to be involved in the processes and hopefully when it gets to the finish line, everyone is comfortable. She said that was the goal and why it was laid out the way it was. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the timeframes are guided by the developer who will be required to submit a lot of information. She said the rate at which the developer gets that information to Planning will determine how quickly the process moves. Ms. Amorose Groomes said after an application is submitted, they have a significant period before they have to begin those submissions and there are not real deadlines of when those submissions happen.

Ms. Husak explained that there are time requirements if the applicant is aiming for a certain meeting date, and for that meeting date, they have to bring in all the application materials. She said once the application is filed and has been reviewed internally, the fire, parks and open space, engineering, and building departments and others as part of the review team, put together comments, revisions, and requests that the applicant has to address prior to being placed on an agenda. She said that how much time it takes to address those comments is up to the applicant. Ms. Husak added that for all the steps for public meetings, whether at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing or the ordinance for rezoning scheduled at City Council, property owners will be notified automatically if they are within 300 feet of the

site. She said if someone is not within that area or did not receive notification for this meeting, addresses would be taken, and notifications will be sent every time public meeting notifications are mailed.

Mr. Randall asked if this would be a part of the Muirfield Association.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that would have to be agreeable by the developer and by the Association and its Board of Trustees or Directors.

Mr. Randal asked Mr. Zeier if he was acting as an official representative of the Muirfield Association in saying that they would welcome this plan into it.

Ms. Amorose said that Mr. Zeier explained that he had the blessing of the Board of Trustees to begin the conversation to incorporate them into the Homeowners Association.

John Hardt clarified that when documents are submitted to the City, a long list of existing stormwater and site design regulations that have nothing to do with whatever action the Commission takes, exist today and at the local, state, and federal level, and that is what the City Engineers will compare the applicant's calculations and design to for compliance. He said one of the hallmarks of all those regulations is that when an entity takes an undeveloped site to develops, it is not permitted to have any impact on the surrounding sites. He said they have to have stormwater that falls on their site, close to their site, and they cannot let it run off the property. He said that the regulations already exist, are outside the Commission's scope, and are something that any applicant would have to comply with for any development within the City.

Warren Fishman said that the applicant's effort was commendable in trying to make everyone happy. He said he liked the first plan better. He said the problem with this plan is that there is not any usable common area. He said there are woods, trees, and water, but no place to play ball or anything. Mr. Fishman said that this area is probably the biggest sea of houses built in Dublin without open property. He said even though there are 1.6 units per acre, there is no common area close to it. He said he liked the previous plan if the lots were cut down on that plan, somewhere close to 19. He said there could be a spectacular development that he thought the neighbors could be happy with, that would rival the Bob Webb patio homes because there would be useable space within the development. Mr. Fishman said it could work to buffer the neighbors and they could walk onto usable space. He said the previous plan was much more creative and pretty. Mr. Fishman said with a few lots missing, it has some real nice usable space. He said ideally, if there were 19 lots on the previous plan, this would be a knockout development with wonderful open space. Mr. Fishman gave the applicant credit for the creative layout.

Joe Budde complimented the applicant for listening to the feedback last time and returning with a density at the lowest level of the surrounding neighborhood. He said he thought the problems with Lots 1, 12, and 13 are going to force the applicant to come up with something different. He said regarding architectural character, the fact that the applicant is in discussions with the Muirfield Association addresses that so it will be adequately addressed.

Victoria Newell thanked the applicant for listening last time. She said she liked the lower density. She said it was fair keeping it at 1.6 units per acre, given the surrounding properties there. She said when comparing the open space on both plans, they looked similar except for the large reserve area near the current farm residences. She said she liked the entry feature and a lower density. Ms. Newell said a little compromise could be gained between both plans, but she definitely liked the lower 1.6 units per acre because she thought it was more respectful to the surrounding site.

Ms. Newell asked how confident staff was in regards to the stream area. She said looking at the photograph she could see that there is probably a swale there, but that it appeared to be nothing more.

Aaron Stanford referred to the Planning Report, on page 6 of 9, and said the yellow highlighted area was what Engineering has currently identified as a SCPZ. He said if there is a portion of the SCPZ that currently would not meet Code, what they were referring to is the lower branch, where Lots 15, 16, 14, and 13 are located. He said without the applicant providing a further analysis and study, which would not be permitted and would be against that Code. Mr. Stanford said that they could see that area being applied for an exemption, and one of the more common exemptions that is successful in these areas are areas that may have a low area that does not have vegetation, an established channel, or a stream bed that can establish vegetation. He said this area currently starts where the existing structure is located. He said it looks similar to areas where we have exempted for that reason.

Amy Kramb said she still was not set on a certain number of lots. She said through the process, as they go through and get to the preliminary development plan when all the surveys have to be done and they have to know exactly where the stream is located, it will let them know how many lots can reasonably be built on the site. Ms. Kramb said the Community Plan states a density of 0.5 to 1 units per acre and the current zoning would allow 1 per acre or 11 homes on the site. Ms. Kramb said the reason the density was set at that was that the site had never been developed. She said everything around it used to be 1 per acre before it was developed. She said she was okay with raising the density to what was around it. She recalled a recent plan before the Commission where a full room of residents was very concerned about water and what it would do to their yards. She said if this gets rezoned as a PUD, Planned Unit Development, all these details can be addressed, as opposed to in the Rural Residential District, where 11 houses could be built on the site without saying what they would look like, within basic reasoning. She said that with a planned unit district, greater setbacks, preservation zones, no-build zones, SCPZs, architectural standards, stormwater management, all can be required in the text. She said that the first plan was more interesting and this was a very typical neighborhood.

Mr. Hardt said the three big issues that this development brings are the issue of stormwater management, the stream corridor, and tree preservation. He said all three are governed by existing City regulations and are hoops that the applicant will have to jump through. He said regarding density, that the 12 to 15 unit density that exists on this site was not put there per se, but left there. He said all of this area originally had the same R, Rural zoning classification and when it was up zoned to let Muirfield Village happen, this property was left behind, so he did not know if it was a deliberate or a conscious decision made. He said he thought it was justified to go through this process and allow the applicant to build 18 or 19 homes because this process allows along the way to negotiate. He said the applicant is in exchange subjecting themselves to the Muirfield Design Review Process and the Muirfield Architectural Standards, establishing No-Build Zones in the rear of the lots, offering to place the same deed restrictions in place as the existing homes, and open space management, which are things that do not exist today. He said ultimately, they will provide long term protection for the homes surrounding to make sure that the site is developed-well and maintained-well and fits with the rest of the community.

Mr. Hardt said absent this process, someone could build 5,000-square-foot homes with all stucco exteriors and a pre-manufactured barn in the backyard where they tinker with their racecar on Saturday afternoons, and there would be no way to control that. He said he thought the trade-off was worth it. He said 19 homes is certainly more than is allowed today, but what we get back for allowing a little bit greater density is worthy it in the long run.

Mr. Hardt said there were aspects of the last plan that he liked better. He said it was a little more creative. He said he would like to see a density in line with what the surrounding neighborhoods have. He said some modification or hybrid between the two plans would be ideal.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agreed this plan was more creative, however the green space is too close to the waterway and she would like to see additional space. She said she would like to see the waterway protected as much as possible. She said she liked the placement of the cul-de-sac on the new plan better than the previous one because it provided more relief from the edge of the stream. Ms. Amorose

Groomes said instead of the rear yards being No-Build Zones, she preferred to see them dedicated back to the Muirfield Association. She said many times, it is easier for people to ask for forgiveness than permission, and she would hate to see some of that area torn down and a swing set pop up overnight. She said if that happened and the area belonged to the Association, it would be considered trespassing. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that the applicant should work with the Association to dedicate the No-Build Zones to them.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the timing issue of the construction and development of the site is out of the Commission's purview. She said that she believed that these will be very popular lots and will go quickly. She said there was a level of confidence that the engineering issues will be resolved with the PUD process. She said it was her thought that the stormwater management will be better when this is finished than as it is now. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the Muirfield Design Standards were being updated and she encouraged the applicant to stay be aware of the changes so that the development text is reflected with those changes. She said the only lot that she was uncomfortable with was Lot 13, not because of the narrow driveway, but that she would like to see the wetland expanded.

Ms. Kramb explained that a PUD was a Planned Unit Development which is a type of rezoning that could be commercial or residential. She said that a PUD comes with a text that has many criteria. She said that a text is recommended for approval to City Council by the Commission. Ms. Kramb said it governs the development and is stricter than the general Dublin Zoning Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the text can go to City Council with a positive or negative recommendation from the Commission.

Ms. Kramb said that the public will have the opportunity to comment on the text at the preliminary development plan stage and at City Council.

Ms. Newell pointed out that all of the City's regulations are available on the City's website. She said there are provisions for stormwater and engineering. She said as an architect, she had a great respect for the City of Dublin's regulations. She said that they are extremely good and always have been in the forefront, especially with stormwater engineering before many other Central Ohio communities adopted them. She encouraged everyone to look at the City's regulations which she thought would help them through this process in understanding things that Planning is going to do before it comes back before the Commission as the applicant moves forward with it.

Ms. Husak said all of the application materials, as soon as they are filed with Planning, are also available on the City's website. She said the website information is constantly updated with provisions, updates, and information.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the applicant did not have any questions for the Commission. She concluded this case, saying that the Commission does not vote on concept plans. She thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and said she really appreciated their passion about the community.

Ms. Amorose Groomes called a recess at 7:43 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Commission Roundtable

Mr. Hardt requested a book bound PDF of the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak said that the entire Zoning Code was online. She agreed to place a PDF in the DropBox instead. She said it was more updated online than Planning is able to update the hard copies.

Ms. Husak said that for the October 15th local field trip, public notification was necessary since all the Commissioners will be going. Ms. Amorose Groomes and Ms. Kramb requested that they meet at City Hall before 9:15 a.m. and leave at 9:30 a.m.

Ms. Husak reported that at the Ohio/Kentucky/Indiana Planning Conference in Columbus last week, a City of Columbus and MKSK presentation focused on what the City of Columbus has done with Public/Private Partnerships in attracting residential development and having parks and open spaces. She said that the Commission trip would begin at the Neighborhood Launch, the Edwards development on Gay Street, where the new Hills Supermarket will be located. She said she would try to arrange for someone from The Edwards Company to meet them to talk about the condominium development which is designed to be traditional in nature. She said then, they would visit Columbus Commons, where the old City Center was demolished to create a beautiful public open space with an entertainment area and where residential construction has begun. Ms. Husak said they would park and walk to the Annex at RiverSouth which is residential, and by the transformed Lazarus building, to Scioto Mile, a public open space with fountains. She said they would probably lunch together at the nearby restaurant and then walk along the riverfront and to the Main Street Bridge. Ms. Husak said depending upon the time remaining, they might drive to Grandview Avenue and Grandview Yard before returning to Dublin by 3 p.m.

Mr. Taylor reported that he had visited The Green in Dayton, and he was not impressed by it. He said it was a life-style mall. He said it was a pretty, 'fake' city that he hoped they did not head towards for the Bridge Street Corridor. He said it looked like a town where you live an apartment above a clothing store. He said there were about ten acres of surface parking so you had to walk ten minutes to get to the street. He said there were planning issues. Mr. Taylor said its location was on the freeway and he was not impressed.

Mr. Taylor said regarding the recent applications developments, he was concerned that the goals the Commission set in the process of putting together the Bridge Street Corridor Code are not fully communicated or understood by the Board of Zoning Appeals or Architectural Review Board. He said that regarding some of the things that the Commission thought were important, he was concerned that those issues are not fully understood by those boards. He said he would like to find a way if possible, that the Commission can get some kind of communication going between them. He said none of the ARB or BZA members were at the Commission meetings to hear all the deliberations that they had and he did not know how much was communicated to them. Mr. Taylor said that the Commission spent a significant amount of time defining the ARB's role in the Bridge Street Corridor and in the approval process, and he was not sure they were fully aware of what their role is that is different than it used to be. Mr. Taylor said he wanted to make sure they had time to talk about that and make sure that they communicate all those things eventually.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said on the iPad, she was not able to open any of the correspondence in Drop Box, iAnnotate, or anything. She said everything else opened.

Mr. Fishman mentioned that many years ago, that the Commission was involved in developing the Glacier Ridge Metro Park. He said he received a very extensive letter from a resident saying that Dublin was usually on the cutting edge, and Columbus was beating us because their Metro Park had climbing walls and all kinds of neat things, and he encouraged City Council to look at some of those things. He said he would forward the correspondence to Council to look at those things so that Dublin can be on the cutting edge. Mr. Fishman said the resident commented that it took 45 minutes roundtrip for Dublin residents to get there and he used those amenities and found there were a lot of Dublin residents using those and would be thrilled to have them in Dublin.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were other comments. [There was none.] She adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

*As amended and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 1, 2012.